



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/637,219	08/08/2003	Benoit Maison	YOR920030225US1	3318
35526	7590	02/13/2007	EXAMINER	
DUKE, W. YEE YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			NEWAY, SAMUEL G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	02/13/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/637,219	MAISON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Samuel G. Neway	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 08 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is responsive to the Application filed on July 8, 2003.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because in FIG. 4, the horizontal arrow leading from item 414 is believed to be an error. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 17 is objected to because of the following informalities: it is believed the phrase "the method comprising" on the first line should read "the apparatus comprising" and will be treated as such. Appropriate correction is required.
4. Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities: it is believed the phrase "a profile[r], wherein the profiler" is a typographical error. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor; subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 11 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 11 – 16 are directed to a "computer program product, in a computer readable medium".

The "computer readable medium", in accordance with Applicant's specification, may be an electromagnetic signal. This subject matter is not limited to that which falls within a statutory category of invention because it is not limited to a process, a machine, a manufacture, or a composition of matter. Instead, it includes a form of energy, which does not fall within a statutory category. Amending the claims to recite – recordable type media - would overcome this rejection in a manner consistent with Applicant's specification.

Also, the "computer program product" can reasonably be interpreted as computer listings only. Computer programs claimed as computer listings per se, i.e., the descriptions or expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory

Claims 17 – 20 are directed to an "apparatus". However, it appears that the apparatus would reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art as software (computer program), per se. The only elements recited as part of the apparatus, "code generator" and "compiler", are not explicitly and deliberately defined in the specification as hardware.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1 – 4, 6, and 11 – 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Arnold et al. (USPGPub 2003/0125955).

Claim 1:

Arnold discloses a method for generating task-specific code for pattern recognition ([0008]), the method comprising:

receiving task-specific input system data of a pattern recognition system and generating task-specific code for the pattern recognition system based on the task-specific input system data (“the distributed speech recognition system allows automatic “speaker adaptation” to be performed locally by the client device ... local parameters ... are adapted locally by the client device in performing its speech recognition function”, [0008], see also [0009] and “the client device is adapting its models in response to the speaker”, [0020]);

Claim 2:

Arnold discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the pattern recognition system performs speech recognition (“parameters ... are adapted locally by the client device in performing its speech recognition functions”, [0008]).

Claim 3:

Arnold discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the task-specific input system data includes one of a language model, an acoustic model, a front-end for computing

feature vectors, and information related to speaker adaptation (FIG. 1, items 120 – 124 and related text).

Claim 4:

Arnold discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the acoustic model includes Gaussians ([0023]).

Claim 6:

Arnold discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the acoustic model is represented as a Hidden Markov Model ([0023]).

Claims 11 – 13 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 3 and are rejected with the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold et al. (USPGPub 2003/0125955) in view of ("Determining the Probability of Words in a String With a Word-Skipping Model ", IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, November 1985).

Claim 5:

Arnold discloses the method of claim 3, but does not disclose wherein the language model is represented as a Hidden Markov Model ([0023]).

The IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin discloses a speech recognition method where the language model is “defined as a Markov source (a hidden Markov chain)” (page 2, lines 11-13).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to represent the language model as a Hidden Markov Model in Arnold’s method because off the shelf Hidden Markov Model software was available therefore freeing Arnold from programming another model.

11. Claims 7, 14, and 17 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold et al. (USPGPub 2003/0125955) in view of Poirier et al (USPN 6,321,372).

Claim 7:

Arnold discloses the method of claim 1, but does not explicitly disclose compiling the task-specific code to form a decoder program.

Poirier discloses a similar method where a source code is modified, such as by further specifying it, in a linguistic service system. Poirier also discloses the code being compiled (“compile … modified source code”, col. 10, lines 52-56).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compile a source code in order to obtain an executable file which is able to run on a computer (Poirier, “compile … modified source code to obtain service executable”, col. 10, lines 52-56).

Claim 14 is similar in scope and content to claim 7 and is rejected with the same rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope and content to claim 7 and is rejected with the same rationale.

Claim 18:

Arnold and Poirier disclose the apparatus of claim 17; Arnold further discloses wherein the pattern recognition system performs speech recognition ("parameters ... are adapted locally by the client device in performing its speech recognition functions", [0008]).

Claim 19:

Arnold and Poirier disclose the apparatus of claim 18, Arnold further discloses wherein the task-specific input system data includes one of a language model, an acoustic model, a front-end for computing feature vectors, and information related to speaker adaptation (FIG. 1, items 120 – 124 and related text).

12. Claims 8 – 10, 15 – 16, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold et al. (USPGPub 2003/0125955) in view of Poirier et al (USPN 6,321,372) and in further view Lanning (USPN 5,787,285).

Claim 8:

Arnold and Poirier disclose the method of claim 7, but they do not explicitly disclose profiling the decoder program to form a profile and determining whether the decoder program is optimized.

Lanning discloses a method of optimizing executable software where the code is profiled and optimized ("automated "profilers" to provide data to these optimizing compilers", col. 1, lines 42-52).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to profile and optimize the code in Arnold and Poirier's method in order to "enhance the run-time performance of a piece of software"(Lanning, col. 1, lines 42-52).

Claim 9:

Arnold, Poirier and Lanning disclose the method of claim 8, Arnold and Poirier do not explicitly disclose wherein responsive to the decoder program not being optimized, automatically modifying and recompiling the decoder program based on the profile.

Lanning discloses automatically modifying and recompiling the code ("The optimizing compiler then uses the information gathered by the profiler to recompile the source code ", col. 1, lines 42-52).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify and recompile the code in Arnold and Poirier's method in order to "enhance the run-time performance of a piece of software"(Lanning, col. 1, lines 42-52).

Claim 10:

Arnold and Poirier disclose the method of claim 7, but they do not disclose compiling the code in several parts corresponding to several modules of the pattern recognition system and assembling the compiled code before execution.

Lanning discloses compiling the code in several parts as claimed in the instant claims ("provide executable code optimized for use with a plurality of operational environments or modes ...", col. 2, lines 42-45).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compile the code in several parts because this "reduces the execution time of the code associated with that environment or mode" (Lanning, col. 3, lines 51-55).

Claims 15 – 16, and 20 are similar in scope and content to claims 8 – 9 and are rejected with the same rationale.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Stanley et al. (USPN 5,684,924) discloses a speech recognition system comprising a core program and a plurality of utility program modules for adjusting various recognition parameters.

Preston et al. (USPGPub 2003/0046061) discloses a method of automatically generating software from one or more predefined functions in accordance with an input statement entered in natural language.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel G. Neway whose telephone number is 571-270-

1058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30AM - 5:30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SN

SN



DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 260